

REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's comments regarding the claim of priority based on an earlier filed U.S. patent application, Applicants have amended the application to insert a reference to the prior application by application number, and indicating the relationship between the applications.

Claim 1 (the only claim of record) has been provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over Claim 8 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/192,317. However, as discussed in more detail hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 as amended distinguishes over Claim 8 of the '317 application. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 differs in respects other than merely broadening the claimed subject matter, as indicated in the Office Action.

A characteristic feature of the present invention as defined in Claim 1 lies in the recitation of a "command converting means for checking the recognized text with a command text dictionary, extracting a command text from the recognized text, determining the text other than the extracted command text as a object text and conducting a morpheme analysis to remove postposition from the text other than the extracted command text and to determine it as the object text,..." On the other hand the corresponding characteristic feature of the co-pending '317 application lies in the recitation of "a command converting means

for checking the recognized text with a command text dictionary, and separating it into a command text and an object text, and a conversation control means for sending the separated command text and object text to said application service provider, ...". From a comparison of the above quoted language from the present application and from Claim 8 of the '317 application, it is apparent that Claim 1 of the present application differs in the recitation of "conducting a morpheme analysis to remove postposition from the text". In this manner, the "object text" can be accurately separated from "command text". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this feature, which is not present in Claim 8, patentably distinguishes the invention defined in Claim 1 from that of Claim 8 of the '317 application.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Walker et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,529). In particular, item 5 of the Office Action (page 4) indicates that the "application service provider" recited in Claim 1 is found in element 28 in Figure 1 of Walker et al. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the application program 28 in Walker et al differs fundamentally from the "application service provider" recited in Claim 1. That is, the application program 28, which is stored in the memory 4, is simply a computer program (as indicated in Claim 1, for example) which controls the overall operation of the system. (See, for example, Column 6, lines 5 through 13; Column 8, lines 35-39; and Column 12, lines 55-60; see also, Abstract.)

The specification of the present application, on the other hand, makes it clear that the “application service provider” of Claim 1 in fact refers to the provider of an information service, such as stock price information, trading partner information, customer information and product information, which may exist in the ASP server group in Figure 1. See in particular, paragraphs [0011], [0019], [0074] and [0112]. More specifically, as indicated in paragraph [0112], for example, the navigation system associated with the navigation information ASP in Figure 25 may be a human being.

Thus, the term “application service provider” in the present application is much more than a mere computer application program. As indicated in paragraph [0011], the application service provider includes “a navigation information application service provider for serving map information, a music information application service provider for serving music information, a broadcast program information application service provider for serving at least one type of information of TV broadcast program information, CS broadcast program information and CATV broadcast program information, and a telephone information application service provider for serving telephone information”. As shown in Figures 18-21, the respective application service providers also include additional elements, such as, for example, a voice input terminal such as a PDA, a mobile telephone, a mobile car PC and a voice input terminal such as a home telephone, TV, PC, depending on the functionality of the particular application

service provider. It is accordingly apparent that the computer application program illustrated as block 28 in the memory 4 in Figure 1 of Walker et al does not correspond to or constitute an "application service provider" within the meaning of that term as used in the present application.

In addition, the Office Action also indicates that the Walker et al patent also discloses "a speech portal server which controls a conversation between said speech input terminal and said application server based on the provided speech", referring in particular to Column 1, lines 21-24. It is noted, however, that, in the present application, the computers associated with the "speech input terminal", the "speech portal server" and the "application service provider" are connected by a network. With this construction, it is possible to demand information processing by a voice command. In this manner, the software for the computers connected to the network can easily be upgraded.

In addition, the Office Action also states that "command converting means for checking the recognized text with a command text dictionary" is disclosed at Column 10, lines 23 through 29 of Walker et al. However, in Walker et al, it is impossible to provide the recognized text as in the present application. That is, in Walker et al, speech recognizer 10 simply provides a "result event 16".

Furthermore, the “result listener” is not a character string as a recognized result, which outputs a “parse tree 20”. The parse tree 20 refers to a “tree” construction of a tag containing a scripting language, and the scripting language is part of an action instruction based on a recognized result. In this manner, the command text is separated as the recognized result by using the command text dictionary after it has been recognized. On the other hand, in Walker et al, the command is determined in a recognition process.

In the present invention, the voice input from the voice input terminal is recognized by the portal server, and is separated into command text and object text. Information stored in an application service provider is ambiguously retrieved, based on the separated text, and a needed information can be offered from the voice input terminal if there is an error in the object text”.

Finally, the Office Action also indicates that “a conversation control means for sending the separated command text and object text to said application service provider, and providing said speech input terminal with information searched by said application service provider” is disclosed in Walker et al at Column 11, lines 3 through 43. However, in Walker et al, the method of the application object is simply started according to a scripting language described in

the grammar. Furthermore, the "application program" stored in the memory is quite different from the "application service provider" as noted previously.

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application should be in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #056207.50948C1).

Respectfully submitted,



Gary R. Edwards
Registration No. 31,824

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
GRE:kms
2684884v1